

## **REMARKS**

Claims 15, 16, and 27-33 are herein amended.

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS**

The amendments to claims 15, 16, and 27-33 merely correct minor typographical errors or were made to more clearly define the Applicants' invention. These amendments were not made for reasons relating to patentability. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application as filed. Applicants submit that no new matter is added with these changes.

### **RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

As stated previously, Applicants elect Group II (claims 16-33) with traverse. A restriction requirement is proper where more than one invention is claimed and the inventions are independent or distinct, *and* failure to restrict imposes a serious burden on the examiner. *See* MPEP at 803. In the instant case, Examiner improperly restricted the claims.

In the Office Action of November 17, 2004 the Examiner divided the invention into two separate Groups stating that the inventions are related as process of making and product made. The Examiner stated that the process does not make a product that has a "release member." However, claim 1 refers to a "release member" that is "adapted for attaching computer components to the connection apparatus by engaging the computer component, wherein manipulation of the release member releases the computer component from the connection apparatus." In addition, claim 16 refers to "engaging the computer component with a release

member,” and claim 26 refers to “manipulating a release member...to disengage the computer component.” Thus, these apparatus and method claims each refer to a “release member.”

Moreover, the Examiner did not explain how a failure to restrict would impose a *serious* burden on the Examiner. According to the MPEP, section 803, “[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits” even if the Examiner finds it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

In this case, the Examiner will not face a burden regarding the use of search terms since similar search terms can be used for claims in both Groups I and II. In addition, the Examiner will not face a burden of reviewing a multiplicity of references since references are likely to be overlapping. This does not rise to the level of a *serious* burden. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully request that the amendments be entered and the restriction requirement be withdrawn. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (650) 335-7185.

Respectfully submitted,  
BROOKS J. DAVIS, ET AL.

Dated: 12/07/04

By: Antonia L. Sequeira  
Antonia L. Sequeira, Reg. No.: 54,670  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7185  
Fax.: (650) 938-5200

23651/08658/DOCS/1472766.1